



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,874	12/11/2000	Hidekazu Arao	1538.1005/JDH	2172

21171 7590 01/20/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER.

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/732,874

Applicant(s)

ARAO, HIDEKAZU

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 10/06/2003. Applicant amended claims 1-19 and added claim 20. The claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims **1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-19, 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al (US. Patent 6,263,201) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Miloslavsky (US. Patent 6,128,646).

3. **As to claim 1**, Hashimoto teaches the invention substantially as claimed including analyzing (analyzing, col 1, ln 37-45/ check, col 5, ln 30-54), a received message (the message reception request, col 5, ln 30-54), a predetermined condition (a transmission date/time, col 5, ln 30-45), time (current time, col 5, ln 37-54/ the date and time, col 10, ln 50-67), a process (transmission content/ transmission, col 5, ln 37-54/ the prescribed process, col 3, ln 1-17/ the message" HAVE A GOOD TRIP TO TOKYO... to be Sapporo, col 10, ln 50-67).

Hashimoto does not teach the term fulfilled. However, APA teaches transfer condition storage means are fulfilled (page 2, ln 9-21).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of APA to Hashimoto in order to ensure that a user can send a transfer condition setting request e-mails disclosing what transfer conditions the user wishes to transfer the e-mails that satisfy the set condition.

Hashimoto does not teach passing said received message to a standard destination of said received message if said means judged that said received message did not fulfill said predetermined condition. However, Miloslavsky teaches if an incoming mail is not answered by

Art Unit: 2126

the selected support person within a predetermined time interval, the mail is re-routed to another qualified and available support person (col 5, ln 30-38).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Miloslavsky to Hashimoto in order avoid the data traffic and work load for routing the electronic mails from a sending computer to one or more recipient computers.

4. **As to claim 2**, Hashimoto teaches a storage device (scheduled transmission files, col 5, ln 30-54), predetermined condition (transmission date/time, col 5, ln 30-54), a processing content (transmission content, col 5, ln 30-54).

5. **As to claim 3**, Hashimoto teaches at least one of ... contents of said message/ transmission destination of said message (transmission content/ transmission format/ recipient, col 5, ln 30-54), a program (a program/ a message transmission program, col 5, ln 30-54).

6. **As to claim 5**, Hashimoto teaches a process (transmission server, col 14, ln 30-45), a processing content (transmission time information, col 14, ln 30-45), a time (times, col 14, ln 30-45).

7. **As to claim 6**, Hashimoto teaches a plurality of messages (messages, col 6, ln 45-53/message, Fig. 12).

8. **As to claim 7**, refer to the rejection of claim 2. Further, Hashimoto teaches e-mail/ mail body (e-mail, col 14, ln 55-67), a predetermined condition (transmission time, col 14, ln 55-67), processing content (an e-mail has reached said terminal, col 14, ln 55-67), a message (messages, col 6, ln 45-53/message, Fig. 12).

Hashimoto does not teach the term fulfilled. However, APA teaches transfer condition storage means are fulfilled (page 2, ln 9-21).

Art Unit: 2126

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of APA to Hashimoto in order to ensure that a user can send a transfer condition setting request mail disclosing what transfer condition the user wishes to transfer the mail satisfying the set condition.

9. **As to storage of claim 8, see the rejection of claim 1.**
10. **As to the message processing program of claim 9, see the rejection of claim 2.**
11. **As to the message processing program of claim 10, see the rejection of claim 3.**
12. **As to the message processing program of claim 12, see the rejection of claim 5.**
13. **As to the message processing program of claim 13, see the rejection of claim 7.**
14. **As to message processing method of claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1.**
15. **As to message processing method of claim 15, see the rejection of claim 2.**
16. **As to message processing method of claim 16, see the rejection of claim 3.**
17. **As to message processing method of claim 18, see the rejection of claim 5.**
18. **As to message processing method of claim 19, see the rejection of claim 7.**
19. **As to message processing method of claim 20, refer to the rejection of claim 1.**

Hashimoto does not explicit teach the a judging unit, a performing unit, a passing unit. However EM teaches adapter 110/ extractor 204/ a parser 206, router 116 (col 14, l n 11-55/col 5, ln 10-40).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Miloslavsky to Hashimoto in order avoid the data traffic and work load for routing the electronic mails from a sending computer to one or more recipient computers.

20. **Claims 4, 11, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al (US. Patent 6,263,201) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of**

Art Unit: 2126

Miloslavsky (US. Patent 6,128,646) and further in view of EM (E-mail reception indication device for E-mail system - changes additional information on E-mail held by server, to unreceived condition or received condition information, if E-mail is unreceived or received by client terminals, respectively).

21. As to claim 4, Hashimoto teaches process (the prescribed process, col 3, ln 10-17), predetermined condition (the designated time, col 3, ln 10-17).

Hashimoto does not teach a process for changing notification destination... when the notification fails. However, Pitney teaches the information in the server is changed to unreceived condition, it email is not received by any one or both the terminals (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of EM to Hashimoto in order to ensure reception of identical E-mail to all computer terminals used by single user thus improving utilization efficiency.

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Pitney to Hashimoto in order to define the immediate performance of chosen enhancement feature when an e-mail message is received from a predetermined sender.

22. As to storage of claim 11, see the rejection of claim 4.

23. As to message processing method of claim 17, see the rejection of claim 4.

24. Response to the argument

Applicant's arguments filed 10/06/2003 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims to recite, " means for passing said received message to a standard destination of said received message if said judging means

Art Unit: 2126

judged that said received message did not fulfill said predetermined condition”, and “ when the notification fails”. The Miloslavsky and EM’ s references met the amended claims.

25. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26. **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

Application/Control Number: 09/732,874
Art Unit: 2126

Page 7

LeChi Truong

August 15, 2003



WENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100